



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—A PROPOSED REDISTRIBUTION OF PARTS IN THE PARODOS OF THE *VESPAE*.

The Parodos of Aristophanes' *Vespae* has already given rise to not a little discussion, and indeed the scenic difficulties and problems which it presents can hardly fail, upon close scrutiny, to become evident. Dr. Arnoldt, in his treatise of nearly two hundred pages (*Die Chorpartien bei Aristophanes, scenisch erläutert*, Leipzig, 1873), has entered into a detailed discussion of the passage. As, however, his whole work is one of general interest on account of important modifications which his results entail upon our understanding of Greek comedy, and as it is to take exception to some of these results in detail that the proposed redistribution is here offered, it may be best to review in outline his work for the benefit of any to whom it may be at present inaccessible.

In cap. I he treats of the chorus where it is divided up among the individual choreutae, viz., with a certain portion assigned to each member of the chorus, and consisting neither of an ode sung by them all collectively nor of half-choruses. This he claims is to be looked for especially in the Parodos, but names (p. 5) as exceptions *Nubes*, *Ranae* and *Thesmophoriazusae*. The others (with the exception of the *Plutus*) he takes up in detail, and includes a passage in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (vv. 655–727) as one among several examples of this assignment of parts to the individual choreutae taking place elsewhere than in the Parodos. The general theory is not new with Dr. Arnoldt, and he acknowledges his indebtedness to Bamberger (*De Carminibus Aeschyleis a partibus Chori cantatis*, 1832), Hermann and others who had done the same thing for Aeschylus; and in particular he discusses Hermann's application to Aristophanes himself in his treatise "*De Choro Vespae Aristophanis*, Lipsiae, 1843."

The general truth of this theory as applied to Aristophanes, Arnoldt seems to have established conclusively. The proofs lie partly in the matter, partly in the metrical form of the choruses. The most obvious indicia of change from one member of the chorus to another are (vid. Arn. p. 4): addresses; exhortations; demands and questions, all of which are directed by one member of the

chorus to some other member, often indeed addressing him by name; the use of the dual number; the frequent repetition of the same thoughts; and, finally, abrupt changes and oppositions in thought. As a good illustration of the necessity of assuming in certain passages one speaker and one only, Pax v. 496 may be quoted, where it is surely absurd to imagine the chorus tugging away at the rope and giving vent *collectively* to the sentiment ὡς καχόνοι τινές εἰσιν ἐν ῥμῖν, and again, in v. 499, ἀλλ' εἴς' οἱ κωλύουσιν.

In cap. II Arnoldt treats specifically of the functions of the Coryphaeus as concerned with the actors, and gives a valuable table of all the choral passages in Aristophanes, which are here in point, classed according to two main groups: 1. Where the Coryphaeus speaks alone, for the chorus, with the actors. 2. Where the chorus itself first speaks as a unit and then the Coryphaeus condenses and repeats its thought; thus observing, in the transmission of the same to the actors, the law that one individual only may speak with one actor alone.

In cap. III the Parabasis is discussed; also other choral odes, and the peculiar Parachoregemata and Parascenia.

In cap. IV he considers the chorus alone, and finally, in cap. V, the position of the chorus in Parodos, Epeisodion, Stasimon and Parabasis respectively.

An investigation so comprehensive and yet so detailed as is this of Arnoldt's cannot fail to be of great importance for all subsequent investigations in this field, and it seems probable that much of his work will firmly hold its own. It would scarcely be surprising, however, if in certain minor matters something remained to be said, and his application in the case of the Vespæ seems unsatisfactory, even from a superficial examination, while a closer inspection renders desirable, if not imperative, a redistribution of details. The whole passage which enters into the discussion is Vespæ vv. 230-487. The following is Arnoldt's arrangement by which the individual parts succeed one another κατὰ στοίχους, according to the external shape of the chorus.

I. Six choreutae (viz. at v. 230, 233, 235, 240, 242 and 246 respectively), or the first στοῖχος in the Iambic tetram., vv. 230-247.

II. Six choreutae (viz. at 249, 251, 258, 259, 262, 266 respectively), or the second στοῖχος in the syncopated catalectic Iambic tetram., vv. 248-272.

III. Six choreutae (viz. at 273, 278, 281, 282, 286, 290), or the third στοῖχος in the Dactylo-epitrites, vv. 273-290.

Philocleon has been shut up by his son Bdelycleon, with the hope of overcoming the former's unseemly lust for acting as dicast. In the chill of the early morning, before dawn, a chorus of old dicasts now enter (v. 230), picking their way through the muddy street by the dim light of lamps borne by some boys who attend them. As they enter they discourse *individually* upon past exploits, speak of Philocleon, the weather, the muddy streets, and of the suit which is to come before them that day. This is answered, presently (v. 317), by a wailing ode from Philocleon, who, unable to get out to them, calls upon Zeus for deliverance. Two by-plays, however, are included (vv. 247-257 and vv. 290-317) in the above, i. e. between the boys who are carrying the lamps and members or a member of the chorus. Finally, v. 332 sqq., the Coryphaeus and chorus engage in sympathetic dialogue with Philocleon.

Now, to Arnoldt's distribution of parts the following objections may be made:—

1. As regards the sense. In the by-play (vv. 247-257) between the chorus and the link-boys he assumes that each one of the three boys takes part in the conversation and a corresponding number of the choreutae likewise. The passage in question commences with a boy breaking in suddenly upon the tetrameter Iambics with a halting 'versus asynartetus.' That it is a continuous conversation between one boy and one member of the chorus seems evident upon inspection (Vespae, vv. 247-257):—

Boy. τὸν πηλὸν, ὦ πάτερ πάτερ, τουτοὺν φύλαξαι.

Chorus. κάρφους χαμᾶθέν νυν λαβὼν τὸν λύχρον προβύσων.

Boy. οἷχ, ἀλλὰ τῷδ' ἐμοὶ δοκῶ τὸν λύχρον προβύσειν.

Chorus. τί δὲ μαθὼν τῷ δακτύλῳ τὴν ἑρμαλλίδ' ὠθεῖς,
καὶ ταῦτα τοῦδ' αἰὶν σπανίζοντος, ὥνόμε;
οὐ γὰρ δάκνει σ', ὅταν δέῃ τίμιον πρίασθαι.

Boy. εἰ νῆ Δί' αὖθις κονδύλοις νοθετήσῃς ἡμᾶς,
ἀποσβέσαντες τοὺς λύχνους ἄπιμεν οἷκαδ' αὐτοί·
κάπειτ' ἔσως ἐν τῷ σκότῳ τουτοῦ στερηθῆις
τὸν πηλὸν ὥσπερ ἀτταγᾶς τυρβάσεις βιάζων.

Even more certainly spoken by one choreutes and one boy is the second by-play (vv. 290-316):—

Boy. ἐθελήσεις τί μοι οὖν, ὦ πάτερ, ἢν σοῦ τι δεηθῶ;

Chorus. πάνν γ', ὦ παιδίον. ἀλλ' εἰπὲ τί βούλει με πρίασθαι
καλόν; οἶμαι δέ σ' ἐρεῖν ἀστραγάλους δῆπουθεν, ὦ παῖ.

- Boy.* μὰ Δι', ἀλλ' ἰσχύδας, ὦ παππία· ἦδιον γάρ.
Chorus. οὐκ ἄν,
 μὰ Δι', εἰ κρέμαιοσθέ γ' ὕμειζ.
Boy. μὰ Δι' οὐ τᾶρα προπέμψω σε τὸ λοιπόν.
Chorus. ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦδέ με τοῦ μισθαρίου 300
 τρίτον αὐτὸν ἔχειν ἄλφιστα δεῖ καὶ ξύλα κῶψον.
 σὺ δὲ σὺκά μ' αἰτεῖς.
Boy. ἄγε νυν, ὦ πάτερ, ἦν μὴ τὸ δικαστήριον ἄρχων
 καθίστη νῦν, πόθεν ὠνησόμεθ' ἄριστον; ἔχεις ἐλ-
 πίδα χρηστήν τινα νῶν ἢ πόρον "Ελλάς ἱρὸν εἰπεῖν;
Chorus. ἀπαπαῖ, φεῦ, ἀπαπαῖ, φεῦ, μὰ Δι', οὐκ ἔγωγε νῶν οἶδ' 310
 δόβωεν γε δεῖπνον ἔσται.
Boy. τί με δῆτ', ὦ μελέα μῆτερ ἔτικτες,
 ἔν' ἐμοὶ πράγματα βύσκειν παρέχῃς;
Chorus. ἀνόνητον ἄρ' ὦ θολάχιόν σ' εἶχον ἄγαλμα
Boy. ἔ, ἔ· πάρα νῶν στενάζειν.

A common-sense interpretation of the passage just quoted points to a continuous conversation between one boy and one member of the chorus. How could, for example, v. 310 be put into the mouth of any one else than the 'father' before appealed to? This one member of the chorus, it is natural to assume, was the Coryphaeus.

2. A second reason for a redistribution of parts is, that in Arnoldt's arrangement certain turns of expression are ignored which in accordance with his own principles should involve a change of speaker. Thus he regards the particle *ἀλλά*, when used not simply adversatively, but to introduce a new idea, as one of the most obvious indicia of a new part. In v. 244, however, where it breaks in abruptly upon a screed about Kleon, he ignores it and likewise the expressions v. 270 *ἀλλά μοι δοκεῖ* and v. 268 *οὐ μὴν*. The other proposed insertions of new parts, while they are not so obvious, are neither forced nor without analogy in Arnoldt's own divisions. If we introduce, at v. 237, a new choreutes at the words *κᾶτα περιπατοῦντε νύκτωρ*, we are simply supposing that No. 3 has turned from No. 2 on his left and addresses the words, from the middle of v. 235 on, to his neighbor on the right, who immediately chimes in and gives some specific details of their past exploits. Or if it seems preferable to introduce a new speaker at v. 241, he is there merely adding a new detail, as would be natural enough in the vivid style of conversation represented. The same

may be said of the introduction of the two choreutae at v. 263 and v. 264 respectively. As a parallel for the transition made by the simple particle *δέ*, Arnoldt's own introduction of new speakers in *Equites* v. 253 and *Acharnenses* v. 219 and v. 302 may be cited. It must be admitted, of course, that it may sometimes be questionable just where the division is to be made, but when once it is granted that there are twenty-four parts to be assigned, the few which do not assign themselves must be disposed of according to individual judgment.

There remain two more proposed insertions, viz., at v. 277 *καὶ τὰχ' ἄν βουβωνιώῃ* and v. 285 *ἔστι γὰρ τοιοῦτος ἀνὴρ*. If now the formal construction of this whole part (vv. 273-290) be considered, it will be seen that these additional choreutae introduced at the end of the first and third quarters, correspond to the speakers of the line, *ὑπαγ' ὦ παῖ, ὑπαγε*, which is to be read at the end of the part and also in the middle, at v. 280, where Arnoldt shows it has probably dropped out. In addition to this improvement in balance and equalizing in amount, the sense is benefited by the proposed arrangement, a new choreutes offering in the one case a fresh suggestion, and in the other a confirmation of the foregoing words of his neighbor, which are peculiarly in keeping with the tone of the whole. And, finally, as an accidental confirmation it may be mentioned that Hermann's original distribution assigned eight choreutae to these lines.

3. Arnoldt's order of succession is objectionable. For (a), in the first place, the choreutes who at v. 251 cuffs a link-boy would, in accordance with his assignment of parts, occupy an inside position (No. 7 in Fig.) where he could not reach the boys, who are supposed by Arnoldt to have walked on in front of the whole chorus. The only way in which it would be easy to conceive of a boy being near the choreutes in question, would be to suppose the boys to have been scattered through the ranks; but on this supposition it were hard to see how the episode would preserve any unity or animation if first No. 8 (according to Arnoldt's division) addressed a boy in front of him, and then No. 9 (who in the *κατὰ στοίχους* arrangement would be behind No. 8) addressed a boy behind the third row, and so on. But by the arrangement suggested the three boys are in a position properly to light the chorus, the by-play is brought directly in view of the spectators, and since the whole part is assigned to No. 9, the Coryphaeus, and to the boy beside him, all mechanical obstructions disappear.

The mechanical objections are even stronger in the second by-play (vv. 291-316) where Arnoldt makes the boys hold a conversation with nine several choreutae scattered all along two files—a conversation which, as above indicated, does not make very good sense unless as a dialogue between two only. We might use here almost the very words of Arnoldt where, objecting to Richter's assignment of the conversation, Pax v. 114 sqq., to more than one of the daughters of Trygaeus, he says (p. 168): "an dem Gespräch mit Trygaeos nur eine und dieselbe Person sich betheiligte und in ihm als Wortführer für die übrigen fungirte. . . . jede neue Frage der Tochter fusst auf der letzten Antwort des Vaters."

(b) Again, by the arrangement suggested, sub-dialogues between two or three members of the chorus fall to those who are walking side by side, and although the chorus is arranged externally *κατὰ στοιίχους*, this seems more effective and natural than that each should address the man behind him and that the conversation should leap over in each case from the back end of the one file to the front of the next.

(c) That the succession of parts should run along the files—i. e. first that next the *θεάτρον*, then the next, and so on—and the action thus pass further and further away from the spectators, seems less natural than that the *ranks* as they successively near the focus of interest should carry on the action.

This involves, however, the whole question of arrangement *κατὰ στοιίχους* and *κατὰ ζυγά*, and Arnoldt has laid it down (p. 29) as a law that to the one or the other of these two are the choruses to be referred, according as the natural demarcations in sense, metre, etc., partition them off into groups of sixes or fours respectively. Now in this is contained an important admission in favor of the proposed theory, for Arnoldt assumes that the order of succession in both cases was from one choreutes to the one behind and not *transversely*, even when the chorus was marching *κατὰ ζυγά*. This indicates that in his estimation the *external* shape of the chorus had no necessary connection with the succession of the parts, which is all that is needed negatively. But as a positive confirmation of the possibility of the transverse order, we may quote the example from the Ecclesiazusae, which, as he says (p. 99) himself, consisted of three *ζυγά* of choreutae, one in the Pro-ode (vv. 478-482), one in the Strophe (483-492), and one in the Antistrophe (493-503), each containing four persons. So that the metre here forces us to accept the transverse order of succession. Likewise in the passage in the

Lysistrata, v. 352 sqq., he changes to the transverse order. At least it is clear that there was nothing in the nature of things to prevent this arrangement from being the one adopted in the *Vespa* provided that the natural demarcations of metre are observed. In the case of the *Acharnenses* (v. 204 sqq.) it may be questioned whether he has not been over-hasty in assuming his groups of fours, as the clumsy device of making the first four choreutae speak twice in succession and the ignoring of breaks like *ἀλλὰ μοι μηνύσατε* (v. 206) and *διωκτέως δέ* (v. 221) point to the necessity of re-arrangement. Possibly vv. 280–284 may have come round to the Coryphaeus, who would then occupy very much the same position that Lucian (*Piscator* I), in his humorous imitation of this passage, causes Socrates to assume. Arnoldt's most cogent proof of the succession by file is the *Parodos* of the *Aves*, where he finds confirmation in the circumstance that the names of the birds are mentioned in sixes by Euelpides and Peithetaerus. But even in the face of this the mechanical difficulties seem greater than in the transverse order, and *οἴπισθεν* (v. 299) could have been said just as well of No. 5 in reference to his position in the second row behind No. 4.

4. Upon the four-fold division of the chorus in the *Epeisodion* (vv. 334–434) Arnoldt relies as strongly confirming the four-fold division of the *Parodos*. But if the strictures made above upon the conversation between the boys and the chorus be found cogent, Arnoldt's arrangement in the *Parodos* would fall of itself, and, furthermore, this four-fold division in the second case is confirmatory of the proposed redistribution into three parts, and in particular of the transverse succession. For the chorus having now faced round towards Bdelycleon's house, each *στοῖχος* becomes a *ζυγόν*, so that the chorus would now be naturally divided into four transverse sections of six each.

5. Finally, the proposed arrangement brings the centre of interest back again to the Coryphaeus, catching up, as it were, the loose ends of the *Parodos* and binding it together into one whole before the fresh turn given, v. 317, by Philocleon.

In conclusion, then, it may be claimed that the proposed change, while undoubtedly open to some objections, offers advantages of a two-fold nature :—

1. An improvement in sense in particular passages.
2. A more natural arrangement for the chorus, both collectively and individually.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.